

REMARKS

Applicant has carefully reviewed the Office Action dated June 26, 2007. Applicant has amended Claims 44-45, 47, 50, 54-56, 58, 61, and 65 to more clearly point out the present inventive concept. Applicant has cancelled Claim 70. Reconsideration and favorable action is respectfully requested.

Claims 65-69 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by *Jalili*. Additionally, Claims 44 through 64 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Jalili* in view of *Mizoguchi et al.* Claim 70 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Jalili* in view of *Woestemeyer et al.*

In responding to Applicant's arguments in the previous Office Action, the Official Action stated:

The Applicant argued that *Jalili* does not describe the reconfiguration of icons after a selection. However, the Applicant claims the number of elements being positioned in a different configuration after each selection of each of the multiple points. The selection of each of the multiple of points corresponds to the selection of the pin. The Applicant does not claim the reconfiguration of the multiple points associated with a portion of the security code (icon).

From this statement it appears that it is not believed that the Applicant has sufficiently claimed that the Applicant reconfigures icons after each selection of a portion of a security code. Thus, Applicant has amended the claims in the following manner to more particularly describe this limitation. Claim 44 includes the limitations of;

detecting selection of multiple points in a graphical image including a number of elements displayed at the client, each of the multiple points associated with a portion of the security code, the number of elements being repositioned in a different configuration after each selection of each portion of the security

code; and

transmitting, after each selection of each portion of the security code, coordinates associated with a portion of the security code that was selected from the client to the server over the connection.

Claim 54 has been amended to describe the limitations of;

detecting selection of multiple points in a graphical image including a number of elements displayed at the client, each of the multiple points associated with a portion of the security code, the number of elements being repositioned in a different configuration after each selection of each portion of the security code;

transmitting after each selection of each portion of the security code coordinates associated with a portion of the security code that was selected from the client to the server over the connection;

processing the coordinates received after each selection of each of the portions of the security code to determine the portion of the security code associated with the coordinates; and

Claim 65 has been amended to recite;

receiving, after each selection of a portion of the security code in a graphical image including a number of elements, coordinates associated with the selected portion of the security code at the server over a connection;

processing the coordinates received after each selection of the portion of the security code to determine the portion of the security code associated with the coordinates; and

Applicant respectfully submits that these claims now more particularly recite the limitations, for example, in Claims 44 and 54, that elements of the graphical image are repositioned in a different configuration after each selection of each portion of a security code and that there is a transmission of coordinates associated with the portion of the security code that was selected after each selection of a portion of the security code. Likewise, Claim 65

describes receiving coordinates associated with the selected portion of the security code after each selection of each portion of the security code at the server and then processing the coordinates received after each selection of the portion of a security code. The *Jalili* and *Mizoguchi* do not operate in this manner. Therefore, the Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 44, 54 and 65, and all claims dependent therefrom, are distinguishable from the art of record and a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Applicant has now made an earnest attempt in order to place this case in condition for allowance. For the reasons stated above, Applicant respectfully requests full allowance of the claims as amended. Please charge any additional fees or deficiencies in fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 20-0780/PAYT-26,276 of HOWISON & ARNOTT, L.L.P.

Respectfully submitted,
HOWISON & ARNOTT, L.L.P.
Attorneys for Applicant

/Brian D. Walker, Reg. # 37,751/
Brian D. Walker
Registration No. 37751

BDW/mep/dd

P.O. Box 741715
Dallas, Texas 75374-1715
Tel: 972-479-0462
Fax: 972-479-0464
August 8, 2007